



50

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,074	12/29/2003	Brian M. Fudge	01-43 C1	6856
30031	7590	01/03/2005	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL W. HAAS, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COUNSEL RESPIRONICS, INC. 1010 MURRY RIDGE LANE MURRYSVILLE, PA 15668				WINAKUR, ERIC FRANK
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				3736

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,074	FUDGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric F Winakur	3736	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8,22,23,27-33 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8,22,23,27-33 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/03.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: it appears that the term "a" (lines 14 and 16) should read "the" since the first and second apertures have already been defined. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 - 4, 6, 8, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regard to claims 1, 29, and 30, the phrase "the wrap member" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Craighead. Craighead teaches a plurality of members for placement on a patient (Figures 4 and 5). Column 4, line 25 - column 8, line 17 describe the various parts of the members and the manner of manufacture of the device. As detailed therein, each member includes a plurality of layers in which several of the layers have concentrically

positioned apertures. Thus, a plurality of axially aligned apertures is taught. Adhesive is used to affix the member to a patient. Cuts separate the individual members and a release liner detachably connects adjacent members. As there are multiple layers defining the member, the member is considered to be defined by at least a first substrate. Further, the claim does not exclude the presence of additional layers/substrates in defining the body member.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craighead as applied to claim 37 above. Craighead teaches all of the features of the claimed invention except that the cut is a perforation or that the members are provided as a roll around a spool. With regard to claim 38, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute a perforation for the cut separating the individual members since these are merely alternate equivalent manners to provide separately removable members attached to a release liner. With regard to claims 40 and 41, Craighead teaches that the strips are packaged in suitable packages (column 8, lines 18 - 20) but does not teach the particular arrangement for this. It would have been within the skill level of the art at the time of the invention to determine appropriate arrangements to provide such a suitable

package, including providing the strips as a roll around a spool, since Craighead teaches that packaging is needed and a roll and spool arrangement was one such well known arrangement.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1 - 4, 6, 8, 22, 23, and 27 - 33 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 - 4, 6, 8, 22, 23, and 27 - 33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,532. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are broader than those of the patent. Thus, any apparatus meeting the limitations of the patent would necessarily meet those of the instant application.

Conclusion

10. Applicant cites references that were of record in the parent case. Of particular relevance, Wang teaches a wrap member oximetry sensor having a plurality of

apertures. However, neither Wang nor any of the other references teach a wrap member as claimed, that includes a release liner configured with a first portion and second portion which respectively surround first and second apertures of a body member and further having the first and second portion of the release liner being separately removable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric F Winakur whose telephone number is 571/272-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5; alternate Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 571/272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Eric F Winakur
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3736